UNITED STATES FOURTH CONTINENTAL CONGRESS

All are Welcome to Participate in the Deliberate, Orderly, and Peaceful, Revolution of the United States

Ronald J. Martin

slcs.us4cc.intro.2023

Secular Library Publications

Preamble

The United States Fourth Continental Congress is Commissioned to Identify a Reliable Government Model, and then Deliberate and Validate a Reliable Government Charter System for the Succeeding Trials of the American Experiment.

Article 000: Greeting

This greeting article is divided into six introductory sections:

§ 000.1: General Problem with the Subsisting Charter System

"The American Experiment" is not just a rhetorical euphemism for the difficulty in self-governing a free society. We live in the generational experiment for evaluating the control systems for such a government. In general, the margin of error has been tolerable, and the subsequent production of the nation has been tremendously beneficial for the modern world. However, the increasingly cantankerous political discourse and persistent social disorderliness that we are enduring should be the noticeable reciprocating symptoms of the over-run of systemic errors in the basic design of the government. The generational experiment is practical, but it is inefficient for long-term economic stability, the better progression of the states, communities, private organizations, families, and individuals that comprise the union and society.

The Preamble to the United States Constitution is not just a well-composed introduction, it is a definitive list of aspects for evaluating the operating system of the American Experiment. Contrary to conventional wisdom, preambles are essential. The Preamble is necessary to contest arguments in sovereignty and administrative law, which subsequently affects the parameters of civil law.

The argument to be contested is that the approach to domestic tranquility has been forfeited and that the remaining parameters for the American Experiment; justice, defense, general welfare, and liberty, are all at risk, as well.

The belief that the political party that is causing all of the problems is going to be irrefutably proven to be dishonest, or reach political enlightenment, cease their opposition to progress, and then all will be good, are illusions derived from the accurate aspects of the government experiment model, but nullified by the unidentified or otherwise, adverse aspects. The evolution of what has gone wrong is not as easy to follow as the legends of what has gone right, but ultimately, it is a very safe bet that none of the subsisting political parties are prepared to be the benevolent oligarchy to guide us to the American Dream and prove that the system designed over two hundred years ago, and then adjusted by amendments here and there, is finally going to work correctly because the smart people from the honest party are finally going to be able to put the right people in the right places at the right time. That is an illusion because as soon as you defeat the corrupt party into submission, you are going to run into the problem with those in your own party and those from the reformed party. The problem remains; we do not know how to

organize the deliberation of social issues, and the subsequent spectrum of the law that we have compiled thus far.

The path to tranquility has to have a law and order approach, and probably will have enlightening effects, lots of social pleasantries, and hints of harmony. Whereas, our anonymous and sexy political scientists are persistently describing events of corruption, protests, disorderliness, terrorism, coups, and the possibility of civil war. We are enduring hysterical protests, and increased social disorderliness, and there are very few activities in American society that suggests that we are even trying to accurately guide the approach to domestic tranquility.

A broken law is more valuable than a perfect law in America.

Something is wrong with the governing system, and it is not just because of the people who are in it. For all intents and purposes, the American Experiment is a closed system, and it nurtures the nefarious just as it nurtures the honest. The problem is in the basic design of the system and amendments cannot fix it.

The primary problem is that the three-branch government only prevents any one person from ascending to a dictatorship, it does not prevent oligarchy; which is a conspired leader of a crony corporate board and management team instead of a box of rocks military to enforce the civil laws. It is better than a dictatorship, but still not what we want, otherwise our civics lessons would describe the approach to oligarchy, and the pundits would not be comparing the presidents to infamous dictators. Political scientists are uniquely aware of the approach to an oligarchy and the improper characterizations in their prime-time fear-mongering. Either a dictatorship is not possible, or the government separation model is unreliable. And if the Iron Law of Oligarchy is true, then why are they referring to the contestants as “partisans,” and colored waves?

It is not true that the American Founders did not expect political parties to form. They just did not know what effect it would have on the judicial and executive branches, because the colonial legislatures were in contest with the King, the British governors, and a mixed judicial system. The Founders did the best that they could with what little information they had. Partisanship is inevitable, because of the incomprehensible variables that have to be coordinated to process legislation from idea to law, and political parties relieve some of that complexity. The Founders experienced aspects of “religious” partisanship in their colonial legislatures, because religious organization has been relatively reliable for organizing robust communities – most people are not macro-economists. The patriots versus the loyalists was probably the first national party system. The legends of the Electoral College and the infamous Three-fifths Clause explain the effort to compromise the obvious state population alliances – big states versus the small states, and slave states versus the free states. The problem is that political scientists still have not figured out what causes the partisanship problem that remains, and that is why the legend of the Founders not expecting political parties remains in circulation.

The altruistic argument that the Constitution is not perfect, but that it is better than any other is no longer a satisfactory excuse for not recognizing its inadequacies and adverse effects on the deliberation process and society.

Article I, Section 5; the rules for legislative order is probably the most overlooked inadequacy. Understandably, the Founders did not know how much more information concerning the rules of order was needed to design a reliable legislature, but it is truly mystifying that political scientists have not focus on the peculiarity with an insistence that it needs to be deliberated for all practical options in pursuit of correcting the often described, “broken Congress.”

To compensate for the lack of reliable rules, “Capitol Hill,” has things like the bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus, majority rules, earmarks, tabs, and “pork barrel spending bills,” to work within the realm of the ever-evolving incomprehensible system of variables that have to be coordinated between the dominant political parties to process legislation into law.

For at least one of the Founders, James Madison, the American Experiment with the angelical make-your-own rules and the two-level bicameral legislative system was doing what we are anticipating to happen; political parties were being (formed and) abandoned in the early stages of the government. Seemingly, the system of state and federal legislatures was filtering out the flawed alliances, and therefore, apparently approaching whatever it is a good political system is supposed to be. As we know, that cannot be what happened, because here we are endowed with a cycling of new and improved dirty tricks, congressional investigations, and October surprises. And now, in the aftermath of healthcare reform, we are electing obviously incapacitated candidates in the never-ending oligarchy contest to change Washington, drain the swamp, and secure the blessings of liberty for we, the all-grateful and enchanted people.

The ominous warnings that we are approaching another civil war is legitimately derived from a reclassified report of a list of precursors compiled by the Central Intelligence Agency from their observations of the fall of foreign democracies. A casual comparison of recent events to the list of precursors suggests that the American Experiment is probably approaching its final failure event. The partisan strategies to control the three branches of government are being construed in various ways, and the information chaos causes some to lose trust in the government which leads to peaceful protests, and that fulfills a precursor from the CIA’s top-secret list. The political frustration leads some to believe that they can be heroic by shocking the public to fix the system through their disruption of events, commerce, and utilities, or by the execution of horrendous violence. Obviously, fulfilling the CIA’s major precursor to civil war.

The prediction of the final failure event is probably estimated in decades, but the deceptive and vulgar political campaigns, perpetual social disorderliness, and cellular rebellion that we are enduring should not be regarded as social growing pains or anything benign. The underlying problem that the redacted CIA report and brilliant political scientists cannot piece together is that the imperfect formulations of government ultimately lead to civil war because a perfectly organized government should never encounter such an eventuality.

The American three-branch model was a decent start-up, but it is not good enough for the unfurled system of thousands of partisan appointments for the hundred-and-some security agencies that create the deep-state oligarchy, nor is the representation system adequate for the diversity of naive, addicted, deviant, and scholarly people that the society has evolved to.

In any event, the American Experiment is being allowed to over-run its errors and detrimental effects on society, because the political scientists are beguiled by Constitutional dogma just like everyone else, and seduced by the commercial rewards for dreaming up ways to blame the other party for inflation, crime, poverty, and the lousy weather.

The separation of government is supposed to be demarcated by certain sections of the law, and then those partitions are subdivided into the familiar three branches. Although there are many sections of the law, there are just a handful of sections that are significant to the balance of government powers, and all of the other sections fall under those in an orderly formulation to fulfill the missions of the governing partitions.

Each partition will have its three processes for governing the coordinated sections of the law; judicial supervision, a legislative assembly, and a security department. The formulation of each partition with its own security department provides for a direct law enforcement check on the other partitions of the government; compared to the dubious and always disappointing bipartisan committees and independent investigations that have to be commissioned for a specific situation.

The requests for independent investigations indicate that there is a problem with the separation of government, and that is because the three branches of government are not inherently in a contest with each other. They are cooperative processes, and the checks on power had to be assigned to the entities, and the inadequacy in that aspect is what creates the contest for control of the three branches by flawed partisan alliances.

The Demarcation of Law configuration will not eliminate political parties, but it will regulate the doctrinaire of the factions because the legislators will be commissioned to specific sections of the law to guard, which is what is missing in the deployment of the subsisting legislatures. The ambition of the partition is supposed to prevail over the flawed alliances with members from the other partitions, as was prescribed by Mr. Madison in the political scientists' favorite essay, Federalist Paper 51.

The subsisting bicameral legislative assemblies are not commissioned specific areas of law, and the evolution of that inadequacy, and then the addition of the Seventeenth Amendment, captured the All-American duopoly of political parties. Duopolies are probably inevitable in legislative assemblies; however, the mission of the assembly is the primary control for the principles of its factions.

Because of the generalized commissioning of the Senate and House, and the inevitable oligarchy contest to control the branches, the primary doctrine of the shared duopoly evolved into doing whatever it takes to win public elections, rather than guarding principles; which is what people should expect from representation.

We know this is true because the designations of the parties have no relation to the principles of organization that the parties campaign. The Republican Party is not based on the principle of improving representation in a republic, and the Democratic Party is not based on the principle of advancing to a true democracy. Although the parties seem to guard their stances on social issues, there is no obligation to maintain any position on any issue. The insightful political scientists describe this phenomenon every night about how the corrupt party used to be tolerable, moderate, and cooperative.

For those other than law scholars, this first encounter with the Demarcation of Law Theory and a brief description of its checks and balances, and why the faulty deployment of the erroneous Three-part Separation Theory is why we are where we are, will probably be incomprehensible, because of Constitutional dogma that prevents adherents from challenging the obvious inconsistencies that did not seem to matter, before. And then there is the technical problem that most people do not understand the law in its sections like lawyers do. Lawyers specialize in areas of law, like doctors specialize in areas of medicine, and engineers specialize in areas of technological advantages; and as such, lawyers work with different legal tools for different areas of the law. Other-than-lawyers are going to need diagrams, animations, and interactive guides to understand how the separation of law will harness the partisan problem.

The Demarcation of Law Theory is not as difficult to deliberate now as it would have been in the past. The Founders were hurried with not much more than the

new and untested Three-part Separation Theory. They had limited professional manpower and medieval publishing technology. Today, not only do we have a more sophisticated separation theory to consider, but we also have a list of security departments that are accurately commissioned by sections of the law that would have been very helpful to the Founders. We have access to a robust community of scholars and practical experts, and there is no rush, because of our confidence in the adequacy of the subsisting charter system. We are unhurried and can take the time to imagine, compose, deliberate, rewrite, and publish, hyperlinked hierarchy listings of directive systems for ordering all of the possible options for organizing the legislative assemblies, executive administration offices, security departments, and subsequent regulatory laws, into an aligned system that will have qualities consistent with scientific calibration and engineered reliability.

We need a better Constitution, because not perfect is not good enough, anymore. That is a fundamental heuristic for evaluating any technology. It is why we have improved tools, information, and sliced bread. Nothing seems to get past the pursuit of perfection, except the almighty United States Constitution, and the primary reason for this is the absence of recognizing that the American Experiment is the generational exploration for government control systems, and the system is beneath our advanced level of sophistication for recognizing systemic biases.

All law and political science scholars should recognize the plausibility of the proposed Demarcation of Law Theory and are advised to set aside all jealousies, disclose all ideological commitments and personal liabilities; and commence deliberations of all aspects of the proposal and its comparison to the American deployment of the Three-part Separation Theory. Scholars should then submit their analysis and opinions to their respective peer review associations for general public review.

§ 000.2: Justification for Reordering the Charter System

Amendments to the subsisting American charters cannot correctly adjust the separation of government. The separation of government is related to the separation of the articles of its charter. This is the untold dilemma that the Founders encountered that forced them to abandon their commissions to amend the Articles of Confederation. The Founders could not amend the Articles, because the order of its articles was not compatible with the order needed to deploy the Three-part Separation Theory. The Founders needed Articles One, Two, and Three, to demarcate the three branches of government; subsequently, formatting the charter.

In essence, government chartering is much more similar to computer programming than architectural drafting, but when the rhetorical analogy was devised nobody understood computer programming. As computer programming has become better known, it seems that not enough computer programmers understand government chartering to correct the analogy. But that will change very soon because several big-tech companies are building “smart cities,” and some want complete townships for their corporate employees’ full indoctrination plans.

It is the fault of the political scientists for having not already detected and revealed the amendment exception, the computer programming analogy, the inherent oligarchy contest in the Three-part Separation Theory, and the lack of scientific research and development of government chartering systems.

Contrary to the popular rhetoric, the American Founders are not turning in their graves because of the misuse or abuse of the Constitution, but rather, because of the continued use of the “not perfect, but better than any other” Constitution. It would be a complete dishonor to the humble Founders to suggest that they did not

have a grander ambition than just a perfect union and that that is what the American Experiment is really all about.

Yes, because of the Constitution, American society has been the most benevolent in world history, but there is at least one more super project that we need to fulfill. We need a reliable government charter system for the developing world. The United States State Department cannot relieve the global problem that subsequently leads to the immigration problem that we endure. The State Department only knows the American system, which works uniquely, because it is a product of its evolution of adjustments. Very much like a jalopy automobile, it works; however, it cannot be duplicated, because it has an obsolete chassis and customized parts to accommodate the unique evolution of the original model and the operator who is accustomed to the peculiarities of the parts and performance.

We need a reliable government charter system that can be translated and replicated for all languages, formatted to properly integrate all levels of government, and convertible for three municipal population dimensions: small, standard, and large. We need a reliable chartering system, because not perfect is not good enough, anymore; and we can do it.

§ 000.3: Local Conventions

There are no laws regulating the research and development of government charters as this publication proves by its existence. Anybody, and any organization, including government employees, may work on and publish a charter candidate. There is no contradiction between defending the subsisting Constitution and participating in the processing of a succeeding charter. If that were not true, then there would not be any government reform committees. The only persistent law regulating government charters seems to be the "consent of the governed," which was established as an American ideal in the Declaration of Independence. And as all political scientists and law scholars know, the primary composer of the Declaration was Thomas Jefferson and he later suggested that social charters be reconsidered by every generation, "the dead should not rule the living," is how apropos, he described it.

The information presented thus far should be enough to compel the law and political science scholars into preliminary discussions concerning the separation of government. Professionals from the hard sciences; physicists, engineers, computer programmers, and the skilled technicians where accuracy matters, will probably be the overwhelming swath of the population that recognizes the "scientific" plausibility of the Demarcation of Law Theory and the folly of the political scientists. Their peer-review associations will probably comprise the validation juries for charter candidates produced in any future conventions.

Contemplation and discussions concerning the reordering of the government charters is a building block to the revolution. All persons are advised to maintain accurate records of their innovative ideas for further review, and billable hours for any successful contributions to the composition of any adopted charters.

A municipal convention is declared upon the public convening of delegates from one municipality with state or federal judiciary supervision to process a charter candidate.

§ 000.4: State Conventions

Although, no person, or organization, is forbidden from writing a government charter, adopting a charter at any level of government will have its measure. At the very least, validated charters will require a ratification referendum, and

subsisting governments governors and legislatures behold the people's trust for initiating such elections.

Further compelling the people's trust and securing the orderliness of procedures will require the subsisting judiciaries to supervise the conventions. The judiciary that supervises a convention should have the ability to persuade the remaining branches of government to approve the ratification election for the validated charter. If necessary, the convention judiciary should be able to organize and secure the ratification election. And if need be, the federal government and sibling conventions may assist in mediating any contest and security for any rulings.

A state, regional, or interstate, convention is declared upon the public convening of delegates from at least two municipalities with state or federal judiciary supervision to process a charter candidate.

§ 000.5: National Conventions

Most Americans will be concerned about the fate of the Preamble to the United States Constitution and Bill of Rights upon the imminence of reordering the federal charter.

There is no reason the subsisting Preamble and Bill of Rights cannot be transferred intact of textural content to the succeeding federal charter. But yes, conventions may validate a charter that may alter such aspects. These, and several social stratification issues, are very important and need to be properly graduated through the local, state, and regional conventions. We need to learn how to properly mediate the national discussion, and the United States Fourth Continental Congress will inevitably be assumed to attempt to accommodate the ambition.

Any vision of a national gathering of delegates commissioned by the subsisting state politicians is probably not going to happen. The state officeholders do not know how to qualify delegates any better than anyone else. The state legislators are only inclined to solicit dimwit crony political scientists from the state colleges for their "puppet show," as is the subsisting standard procedure in state and municipal amendment conventions. The better ambition is to compel all of those who are inclined, talented, and skilled for the project to show up and do it because they want to do it and know how to do it.

As implied previously, there is a possibility that scholars and experts from different states may contest ideas (Federalist 51 Project and/or Broken Congress Symposium), but the official national gatherings will probably be more ceremonial than legislative. The content of a modern formatted national charter will probably be ninety-nine percent composed at the state and regional levels and agreed upon in the virtual environment of modern communications.

The final validation for a national charter candidate will probably be held in Philadelphia in commemoration of the Founders' validation convention. Then, after a successful state ratification tally, the decommissioning of the subsisting Constitution and the commissioning of the succeeding charter will probably be held in New York City in commemoration of the federal government in 1789.

Besides, where else would we start the largest parade the world has ever seen?

Welcome to the United States Fourth Continental Congress.

§ 000.6: Transition Security

Conventions and transition procedures will be deliberate, orderly, and peaceful.

§ 000.61: Honorary Invitations

United States Medal of Honor recipients, Nobel Laureates, and foreign leaders of state will be welcome to attend the conventions upon compliance with convention security.

§ 000.62: Commercial Reporter Access

Commercial reporters will be permitted perimeter and gallery accommodations regulated by established municipal ordinances, and convention security.

§ 000.63: Public Access

Public attendance will be regulated by delegate sponsorship, established municipal ordinances, and convention security. Relatively few spectators will be permitted to attend the convention court sessions. All protests and contests must be registered with the municipal police services identifying all aspects of the civil assembly or artistic demonstration. Marching routes will be scheduled by the permits issued by the police to accommodate emergency and motorcade routes.

§ 000.64: Persistence of Security Missions

All federal, state, and municipal security agencies are responsible for the continuation of their missions to protect the United States from foreign invasion and domestic disorderliness during the reconstitution process. All federal, state, and municipal appointments are responsible for their watches until properly relieved by the appointment process described in the succeeding charters. Officers are to be confident that their commissions will not be altered due to revelations from the convention courts. Any relative alterations will not be effective until the adoption of the succeeding charter and subsequent commissioning of the relative security agencies and specific offices. Federal, state, and municipal courts retain all responsibilities for enforcing law and order during the transition. The civil courts and legal codes will not incur any adverse disruption of service during the transition, because new charters are rendered to correct the inadequacies of the electoral, legislative, and statutory law; and not the regulatory, criminal, and common laws that are "already on the books." Any adjustments to such laws will not occur until after the adoption of the succeeding charter and promulgation of legislation affecting the subsisting regulations.

§ 000.65: Prosecution of Interference

All evidence of interference, most notably, vandalism of documents necessary for the accurate auditing and secure transition of the government will be investigated and prosecuted as appropriate with subsisting, and anticipated, state and federal laws. All officials, past and present, contemplating their liability for transactions during the former government administrations are advised to seek legal counsel. Contempt for the reconstitution process by any government official will be considered suspicious and will be investigated for possible illegal transactions. Unlike the former governments, the prosecution of law will be correctly diversified from factional governing and will be able to process the workload unencumbered by any personal prejudice, political bias, or ethnic discrimination. The succeeding government will prosecute all crimes committed against the United States' orderly approach to Justice.

§ 000.66: Documentation

All records of petitioned and validated charters are to be properly archived by the states until secured by the succeeding federal government.